arXiv:1512.02368v3 [math.AP] 15 Dec 2015

Stochastic two-scale convergence in mean revisited and stochastic homogenization of nonlinear plate model

Peter Hornung
FB Mathematik, TU Dresden
01062 Dresden (Germany)

Igor Velčić
University of Zagreb,
Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing
Unska 3, Zagreb (Croatia)

Abstract

We introduce the new variant of the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence (the original notion was introduced by Bourgeat, Mikelić and Wright) and we use it to solve the problem of stochastic homogenization of the elastic plate in the bending regime.

Keywords: elasticity, dimension reduction,stochastic homogenization, stochastic two-scale convergence.

1 Introduction

Abstract

We introduce a variant of the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence (the original notion was introduced by Bourgeat, Mikelić and Wright) and we use it to solve the problem of stochastic homogenization of elastic plate in the bending energy regime.

Keywords: elasticity, dimension reduction,stochastic homogenization, stochastic two-scale convergence.

In [BMW94] the following notion of stochastic two-scale convergence is given: A sequence (u^ε) bounded in $L^2(\Omega \times S)$ is said to stochastically two-scale converge to $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega \times S)$ if for every admissible $\psi \in L^2(\Omega \times S)$ we have that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{\Omega \times S} u^\varepsilon(\omega, x) \psi(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega, x) dx dP = \int_{\Omega \times S} u_0(\omega, x) \psi(\omega, x) dx dP.$$

Here $S \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a bounded domain, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is a probability space, $(T_x)_{x \in \mathbf{R}^n}$ is an ergodic dynamical system on Ω with respect to P (cf. below for details). The notion of admissibility imposes the measurability of the mapping

$$(\omega, x) \to \psi(T_x\omega, x), \quad (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S.$$

Instead of using test functions in the space $L^2(\Omega \times S)$, we could use test functions in $C_0^\infty(S) \otimes L^\infty(\Omega)$ or any other dense subset of $L^2(\Omega \times S)$ which guarantees the measurability property. The above notion was successfully applied to stochastic homogenization of linear and non-linear (monotone operators) elliptic problems. It was generalized in [SW11] to include additional periodic oscillations and used to obtain stochastic homogenization of integral functionals with convex integrands. Another generalization was made in [ZP06] to include random singular structures.
However, this notion is not suitable for the stochastic homogenization of plates, for two main reasons. The first drawback is that if we consider the constant sequence 1_A, where $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we can easily conclude using the ergodic theorem (cf. Theorem 2.9 below) that for $f \in L^\infty(\Omega), g \in C_0^\infty(S)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{S \times \Omega} 1_A(\omega) f(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega) g(x) dx dP &= \int_\Omega 1_A(\omega) \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_S f(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega) g(x) dx dP \\ &= P(A) \int_\Omega f(\omega) dP \int_S g(x) dx \\ &= \int_{S \times \Omega} P(A) f(\omega) g(x) dx dP. \end{aligned}$$

This means that the constant sequence 1_A stochastically two-scale converges to the number $P(A) = E(1_A)$, E denoting expectation. This is not desirable, since we do not want to lose information on the constant sequence 1_A. Moreover, for these reasons the expected property that the product of strongly and stochastically two-scale convergent sequence converges to the product of limits is not satisfied; see for comparison Proposition 2.13 below. In order to deal with this problem, we introduce additional test functions and we use test functions in the subspace of $L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(S)$.

The second problem arising from the notion introduced in [BMW94] is connected with the compactness result. Namely, let us consider a sequence (u^k) which is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S))$. This sequence, for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, has a strongly convergent subsequence in $L^2(S)$. However, the indices of the convergent subsequence depend on $\omega \in \Omega$. (In the linear case one can use a uniqueness argument when dealing with the solutions of some partial differential equation.) If we want the product of this sequence with some other weakly stochastically two-scale convergent sequence to converge weakly stochastically two-scale to the product of the limits, then we need to take into account indices that also change randomly. This forces us to define the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence with respect to some increasing integer valued random variables. It reflects through the fact that we have to take into account the oscillations that change randomly, cf. Definition 2.5 below. Another reason why it is useful to have a notion of stochastic two-scale convergence with respect to some increasing sequence of integer valued random variables is explained in Remark 2.24 and Remark 2.25. In this paper we will, for simplicity, deal with the Hilbertian setting. We plan to address more general setting in the future work.

Regarding periodic homogenization of the bending theory of plates, recently the results from [FJM02, FJM06] were used to obtain the homogenized bending plate theory from three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity by means of Γ-convergence. It was assumed that the material oscillates with period $\varepsilon(h)$ when the thickness of the plate is h. In [HNV14] different models were obtained depending on parameter $\gamma = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{h}{\varepsilon(h)}$, where it was assumed that $\gamma \in (0, \infty]$. The case $\gamma = 0$ is more subtle and is only partially covered under the additional assumption that $\varepsilon(h)^2 \ll h \ll \varepsilon(h)$, cf. [Vel15] for details. Due to the geometrical constraint arising in the bending theory of plates (the limiting deformations are $W^{2,2}$ isometries, see Section 3), this case is more complex than the case of von Kármán plate theory and the bending theory of rods, where the homogenization can be carried out without any periodicity assumption, cf. [Vel, MV].

For these reasons, it seems natural to address the problem of stochastic homogenization for the bending theory of plates. However, the main result in the present article is only partial, in that we are able to obtain the model only under an additional assumption on the smallness of bending energy, cf. Theorem 3.4 below. This means that we are not able completely to adapt the approach from [HNV14] to the abstract setting of stochastic homogenization. For simplicity, we consider only the case when $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. The other cases can be analyzed similarly. Without the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence we are not able to solve the problem; the usual approach for stochastic

homogenization in the context of calculus of variation does not necessarily need stochastic two-scale convergence, cf. [DMM86a, DMM86b] for the convex case and [GD] for the non-convex case.

Notation

The scalar multiplication in the Hilbert space H of the vectors $a, b \in H$ is denoted by $(a, b)_H$. If $H = \mathbf{R}^n$ it is denoted by $a \cdot b$. By $\nabla' = (\partial_1, \partial_2)$ we denote the gradient with respect to the first two variables. For a vector $v \in \mathbf{R}^3$, by A_v we denote the antisymmetric tensor defined by $A_v x = v \times x$. For $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ by 1_D we will denote the characteristic function of the set D. By $\iota : \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2} \to \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ we denote the natural inclusion

$$\iota(G) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1,2} G_{\alpha\beta} e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta.$$

For a matrix $M \in \mathbf{R}^{n\times n}$ by M_k we denote the k-th column of M, for $k = 1, \ldots, n$. By ∇' we denote the gradient with respect to the first two variables $\nabla' f = (\partial_1 f, \partial_2 f)$. For $A \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ by A' we denote the matrix in $\mathbf{R}^{3\times 2}$ that consists of first two columns of matrix A. By $\mathbf{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ we denote the space of symmetric matrices, while by $\mathbf{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{skw}}$ we denote the space of antysymmetric matrices).

2 Stochastic two-scale convergence in mean

2.1 Probability framework

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space. We will assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is countably generated which implies that the spaces $L^p(\Omega)$, for $p \in [1, \infty)$, are separable. By S we will denote the domain in $\mathbf{R}^n$. With I we denote the interval $I = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Definition 2.1. *A family $(T_x)_{x\in\mathbf{R}^n}$ of measurable bijective mappings $T_x : \Omega \to \Omega$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is called a dynamical system on Ω with respect to P if*

a. $T_x \circ T_y = T_{x+y}$;

b. $P(T_x F) = P(F)$, $\forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $F \in \mathcal{F}$;

c. $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \to \Omega$, $(\omega, x) \to T_x(\omega)$ is measurable (for standard σ-algebra on the product space, where on $\mathbf{R}^n$ we take Lebesgue σ-algebra).

We define the notion of ergodicity for the dynamical system.

Definition 2.2. *A dynamical system is called ergodic if one of the following equivalent condion is fullfilled*

a. f *measurable,* $f(\omega) = f(T_x\omega)$, $\forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, *a.e.* $\omega \in \Omega \implies f(\omega) =$ *const. for* P*-a.e.* $\omega \in \Omega$.

b. $\forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $P((T_xB \cup B)\backslash(T_xB \cap B)) = 0 \implies P(B) \in \{0, 1\}$.

For $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ write $f(\omega, x) := f(T_x\omega)$, defining $f \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^n, L^p(\Omega))$. On $L^2(\Omega)$ we can define the unitary action

$$U(x)f = f \circ T_x, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\Omega).$$

It can be shown that a, b, c of Definition 2.1 imply that this is strongly continuous group (see [JKO94]) We define the operator D_i as an infinitesimal generator of the unitary group U_{x_i}. This means that

$$D_i f = \lim_{x_i \to 0} \frac{f(T_{x_i}\omega) - f(\omega)}{x_i},$$

where the limit is taken in L^2 sense. Also we have that $iD_1, \ldots, iD_n$ are commuting, self-adjoint, closed, and densely defined linear operators on the separable Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega)$. The domain $\mathcal{D}_i(\Omega)$ of such operator is given by the set of L^2 functions for which the limit exists. We denote by $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ the set

$$W^{1,2}(\Omega) := \mathcal{D}_1(\Omega) \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n(\Omega).$$

We define the following spaces

$$\begin{aligned} W^{k,2}(\Omega) &= \{f \in L^2(\Omega) : D_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots D_n^{\alpha_n} f \in L^2(\Omega), \alpha_1 + \cdots \alpha_n = k\}; \\ W^{\infty,2}(\Omega) &= \bigcap_{k \in \mathbf{N}} W^{k,2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the standard semigroup property it can be shown that $W^{\infty,2}$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega)$. We also define the space

$$\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) = \{f \in W^{\infty,2}(\Omega) : \forall(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbf{N}_0^n, \quad D_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots D_n^{\alpha_n} f \in L^\infty(\Omega)\}.$$

By the smoothening procedure explained below it can be shown that $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^p(\Omega)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and in $W^{k,2}(\Omega)$, for any k. Notice that $D_i f$, due to the closedness property of the infinitesimal generator, can be equivalently defined as the function that satisfies the property

$$\int_\Omega D_i f g = -\int_\Omega f D_i g, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega).$$

If $f \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ we may also define $Df(\omega, x) = Df(T_x\omega)$ for all x. It can be shown that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ the function $Df(\omega, \cdot)$ is the distributional derivative of $f(\omega, \cdot) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^n)$ and the following identity holds (see [GD]) :

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1,2}(\Omega) &= \{f \in W^{1,2}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^n, L^2(\Omega)) : f(x+y,\omega) = f(x, T_y\omega), \quad \forall x, y, \omega\} \\ &= \{f \in C^1(\mathbf{R}^n, L^2(\Omega)) : f(x+y,\omega) = f(x, T_y\omega), \quad \forall x, y, \omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $iD_1, \ldots, iD_n$ are commuting, self-adjoint, closed, and densely defined linear operators on the separable Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega)$ we can apply spectral theorem in its multiplicative operator form (see,e.g., [RS80, pages 260-261]) and conclude that there is a measure space $(M, d\lambda)$, with a finite measure λ, a unitary operator

$$V : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(M, d\lambda) = L^2(M),$$

and real valued $a_k \in L^p(M)$, $\forall p \in [1, \infty)]$, such that

a. $\psi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ if and only if $a_k(\cdot)V\psi(\cdot) \in L^2(M), \forall k$.

b. $\psi \in VW^{1,2}(\Omega)$ implies $VD_kV^{-1} = ia_k(\cdot)\psi(\cdot), \forall k$.

c. $\psi \in VL^2(\Omega) \implies VU(x)V^{-1}(\cdot) = \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^n ix_k a_k(\cdot)\right)\psi(\cdot)$.

Here the space $L^2(M, d\lambda)$ consists of complex valued square integrable functions. It is easy to see that the set $\cap_{i=1}^n \{a_i = 0\}$ consists of one point. This follows from the fact that the set $\cap_{i=1}^n \{f \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) | D_i f = 0\}$ consists of constant functions (which is the consequence of ergodicity).
As in [BMW94] we define the smothening operator: for $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ we set:

$$\varphi * k(\omega) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \varphi(T(x)\omega)\hat{k}(x)dx, \omega \in \Omega,$$

where $\hat{}$ denotes the transform

$$\hat{k}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \exp(ix \cdot \xi)k(\xi)d\xi.$$

We denote by S_0 the set of all functions of the form $\varphi * k$ on Ω as φ varies over $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and k varies $C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$. The following properties are satisfied

a. $V(\varphi * k)(\cdot) = k(a_1(\cdot), \ldots, a_n(\cdot))(V\varphi)(\cdot)$.

b. $S_0 \subset C^\infty(\Omega)$; for $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$,

$$D^\alpha(\varphi * k)(\omega) = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \varphi(T(x)\omega)(\partial^\alpha \hat{k})(x)dx.$$

c. S_0 and $C^\infty(\Omega)$ are strongly dense in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Using the property a it is easily seen that $\varphi * k$ is well defined and continuous from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$. By using smoothening procedure one can show that there exists a countable dense subset of $L^2(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ (see [BMW94]). Following [SW11] we denote by $\|\cdot\|_{\#,2}$ the seminorm on $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ given by

$$\|u\|_{\#,2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|D_i u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}$ we denote the completition of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\#,2}$. The gradient operator $\nabla_\omega = (D_1, \ldots, D_n)$ extends by continuity to the unique mapping from $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}$ to $(L^2(\Omega))^n$. By the density argument it is easily seen that $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is also the completition of $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ in $\|\cdot\|_{\#,2}$ seminorm.

Proposition 2.3. *The following is satisfied*

a. $VW^{1,2}(\Omega) = \{f : M \to \mathbf{C} \mid f \in L^2(M)$ *and* $a_i f \in L^2(M), i = 1, \ldots n\}$.

b. $V\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega) = \{f : M \to \mathbf{C} \mid a_i f \in L^2(M), i = 1, \ldots n\}$.

Remark 2.4. *The identities a and b have the meaning after complexification, i.e., looking $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ as pairs of themselves. In the sequel we will always make this identification when necessary.*

Proof. The first claim follows by the isometry property and the second claim follows by approximation $f^n = f1_{|f|\leq n}$ and by the fact that the set of functions on the right hand side is complete. □

For $f \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)^n$ we define the stochastic gradient and divergence

- $\nabla_\omega f = (D_1 f, \ldots, D_n f)$;
- $\mathrm{div}_\omega v = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i v_i$;

2.2 Definition and basic properties

By $S \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ we denote the bounded domain. For vector spaces V_1, V_2 by $V_1 \otimes V_2$ we denote the usual tensor product of the spaces V_1, V_2. We define the following notion of stochastic two-scale convergence.

Definition 2.5. *Let $1 < p \leq \infty$, let (ε_k) be a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero and let $(N_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of monotonically increasing integer valued random variables. We say that a sequence (u^k), bounded in $L^p(\Omega, L^2(S))$, converges stohastically two-scale in mean with respect to the sequence (N_k) to $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega, L^2(\Omega\times S))$ if for every $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)\otimes\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)\otimes C_0^\infty(S)$ we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Omega\times S} u^k(\omega,x)v(\omega,T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1}x}\omega,x)dxdP = \int_\Omega\int_\Omega\int_S u_0(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)v(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)dxdPdP.$$

We denote this by $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\underset{p}{\rightharpoonup}} u_0$. When $p=\infty$ we will omit the subscript p.

Remark 2.6. *By density argument we can use as test function any function in $L^\infty(\Omega)\otimes L^\infty(\Omega)\otimes L^2(S)$.*

Remark 2.7. *When dealing with dimensional reduction we will use the following slight variant of the above definition: For a sequence (u^k), bounded in $L^p(\Omega, L^2(S\times I))$, we say that it converges weakly stohastically two-scale in mean with respect to the sequence (N_k) to $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega, L^2(\Omega\times S\times I))$ if for every $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)\otimes\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)\otimes C_0^\infty(S)\otimes C_0^\infty(I)$ we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Omega\times Q} u^k(\omega,x)v(\omega,T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1}x}\omega,x,x_3)dxdP = \int_\Omega\int_\Omega\int_Q u_0(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)v(\omega_1,\omega_2,x,x_3)dxdPdP.$$

We will denote this by $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\underset{p,r}{\rightharpoonup}} u_0$. Again, in the case $p=\infty$ we will write $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\underset{r}{\rightharpoonup}} u_0$.

Remark 2.8. *We are interested in the case $p=\infty$ since in the application we often have compactness in this space (see Theorem 3.3 below) and some properties that we need we are able only to prove in this case (argumentation by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem). However, to prove the existense of u_0 on a subsequence, the case $p<\infty$ is an intermediate step.*

Before we proceed we will state the ergodic theorem.

Theorem 2.9 (Ergodic theorem)**.** *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space with an ergodic dynamical system $(T_x)_{x\in\mathbf{R}^n}$ on Ω. Let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ be a function and $A \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be a bounded open set. Then for P-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_A f(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x})dx = |A|\int_\Omega f dP.$$

Furthermore, for every $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $1 \le p \le \infty$, and a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, the function $f(\omega, x) = f(T_x\omega)$ satisfies $f(\omega, \cdot) \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbf{R}^n)$. For $p < \infty$ we have $f(\omega, \cdot/\varepsilon) = f(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot}\omega) \rightharpoonup \int_\Omega f dP$ weakly in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbf{R}^n)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The following theorem is a basic tool for proving the existence of stochastic two-scale limit on a subsequence. Its proof can be found in [CDG02].

Theorem 2.10. *Let X be a subspace (not necessarily closed) of a reflexive space Y and let $f_k : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of linear functionals (not necessarily continuous). Assume there exists a constant $C > 0$ which satisfies*

$$\limsup f_k(x) < C\|x\|_Y, \quad \forall x \in X.$$

There then exist a subsequence $(k_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a functional $f \in Y'$ such that

$$\exists \lim_n f_{k_n}(x) = f(x), \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Remark 2.11. *If X is dense in Y then we have $\|f\|_{Y'} \le C$.*

The following proposition gives us the existence of two-scale limit on a subsequence.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $1 < p \le \infty$, let (ε_k) be a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero, let $(N_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of monotonically increasing integer valued random variables and let $(u^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a bounded sequence in $L^p(\Omega, L^2(S))$. Then it admits a subsequence, still denoted by (N_k), which converges weakly stochastically two-scale in mean to some $u_0 \in L^p(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S))$.*

Proof. For $1 < p < \infty$, the proof follows by defining the functionals

$$L_k(f_k) = \int_{\Omega\times S} u^k f_k dx d\mu, \quad (f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(S)),$$

$$f_k = f(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x).$$

and by applying Theorem 2.10 with $Y = L^q(\Omega, L^2(\Omega\times S))$, and $X = \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)\otimes L^\infty(\Omega)\times\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(S)$, where q is the number that satisfies $1/p+1/q = 1$ (notice that

$Y' = L^p(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S)))$. Firstly we observe that as consequence of Birkhoff's ergodic theorem we have that for every $f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(S)$ it is satisfied

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\Omega\times S} f(\omega, T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega, x) = \int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S} f(\omega_1, \omega_2, x) dP dP dx. \tag{1}$$

By using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we conclude that for every $f \in X$ we have

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} |L_k(f_k)| \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \|u^k\|_{L^p(\Omega,L^2(S))} \|f_k\|_{L^q(\Omega,L^2(S))}. \tag{2}$$

Using (1) and ergodic theorem we can conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_k\|_{L^q(\Omega,L^2(S))} = \|f\|_{L^q(\Omega,L^2(\Omega\times S))}.$$

From this we have the claim. The case $p = \infty$ follows by Remark 2.11 and from the fact that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(\Omega\times S))} = \lim_{p\to\infty} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega,L^2(\Omega\times S))}, \quad \forall u \in L^1(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S)).$$

□

In the sequel we will deal with the case $p = \infty$.

Proposition 2.13. *a. If (ε_k) is a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero, (u^k) is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S))$ and for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $u^k(\omega, \cdot) \to u(\omega, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S))$ strongly in $L^2(S)$, then $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} u$ stochastically two-scale in mean, for any $(N_k)_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$, increasing integer valued sequence.*

b. If (ε_k) is a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero, $(v^k) \subset L^\infty(\Omega\times S)$ is uniformly bounded by a constant and almost surely we have that $v^k(\omega, \cdot) \to v(\omega, \cdot)$ strongly in $L^1(S)$ and if (u^h) is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S))$ and $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} u$ stochastically two-scale in mean, for some $(N_k)_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ increasing integer valued sequence, then we have that $v^k u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} vu$.

Proof. The proof of (a) goes directly. The proof of (b) follows from the fact that we have almost surely that $v^k(\omega, \cdot) \to v(\omega, \cdot)$ strongly in $L^2(S)$ by Lebesgue theorem on dominated convergence. □

The following proposition will be used to prove Proposition 2.15, which gives us the form of stochastic two-scale limits of gradients.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $f \in (L^2(\Omega))^n$ be such that*

$$\int_\Omega f \cdot g = 0, \quad \forall g \in (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega))^n \text{ such that } \operatorname{div}_\omega g = 0.$$

Then there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $f = \nabla_\omega \psi$.

Proof. Notice that, by testing with the constant functions we obtain $\int_\Omega f = 0$. From this we conclude

$$Vf(m) = 0, \lambda \text{ a.e. on the set } \cap_{i=1}^n \{a_i = 0\}.$$

Notice also that $\operatorname{div}_\omega g = 0$ implies $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i V g^i(\cdot) = 0$. Using the test functions of the form

$$Vg_i^{lm}(\cdot, \omega_2, x) = \begin{cases} 0, & i \neq l, m; \\ a_m(\cdot) k(a_1(\cdot), \dots, a_n(\cdot)) V g^1(\cdot), & i = l; \\ -a_l(\cdot) k(a_1(\cdot), \dots, a_n(\cdot)) V g^1(\cdot), & i = m; \end{cases}$$

for some $g_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$, $l, m = 1, \dots, n$, $l \neq m$, and using the density argument we obtain that for every $l, m = 1, \dots, n$ and every $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ we have

$$a_m(\cdot) k(a_1(\cdot), \dots, a_n(\cdot)) V f_l(\cdot) = a_l(\cdot) k(a_1(\cdot), \dots, a_n(\cdot)) V f_m(\cdot).$$

We define

$$V\psi(\cdot) = -i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{V f_i(\cdot)}{a_i(\cdot)} 1_{\{a_1 = 0, \dots, a_{i-1} = 0, a_i \neq 0\}}.$$

It is easily seen that by Proposition 2.3 *b* that ψ satisfies the required properties. □

Proposition 2.15. *Let (ε_k) be a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero and let (N_k) be a monotonically increasing sequence of integer valued random variables and (u^k) be a bounded sequence in $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S))$ such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $u^k(\omega, \cdot)$ converges strongly in L^2 to $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S))$. Then there exists a subsequence, still indexed by k, and $u_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)))$ such that*

$$\nabla u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla u_0(\omega_1, x) + \nabla_{\omega_2} u_1(\omega_1, \omega_2, x).$$

Proof. Since ∇u^k is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathbf{R}^n))$, by using Proposition 2.12 we conclude that there exists $f \in (L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S))^n$ such that

$$\nabla u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla u_0(\omega_1, x) + f(\omega_1, \omega_2, x).$$

By using the Proposition 2.14 we need to show that for a.e. $(\omega_1, x) \in \Omega \times S$

$$\int_\Omega f(\omega_1, \cdot, x) \cdot g = 0, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \text{ such that } \operatorname{div}_\omega g = 0. \tag{3}$$

We take $g^1 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $g^2 \in (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega))^n$ such that $\operatorname{div}_\omega g^2 = 0$ and $g^3 \in C_0^\infty(S)$ and define $g \in (L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(S))^n$ by $g = g^1 g^2 g^3$. Next we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S} f \cdot g \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\Omega\times S} (\nabla u^k(\omega, x) - \nabla u_0(\omega, x)) \cdot g^1(\omega) g^2(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega) g^3(x) dx dP \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \int_S (u^k(\omega, x) - u_0(\omega, x)) \Big(g^1(\omega) g_1^2(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega) \partial_1 g^3(x) + \cdots \\
&\qquad + g^1(\omega) g_n^2(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega) \partial_n g^3(x) \Big) dx dP = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $\partial_j g_i^2(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}} D_j g_i^2(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x}\omega)$. From this we conclude (3) and finish the proof. □

In the sequel we continue with the assumption $n = 2$. The following proposition can be proved in the same way as Proposition 2.14.

Proposition 2.16. *Assume that $n = 2$ and let $f \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ be such that $\int_\Omega f = 0$ and*

$$\int_\Omega (f_1, f_2) \cdot (-D_2 g, D_1 g) = 0, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega).$$

Then there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $f = (D_1\psi, D_2\psi)$.

Remark 2.17. *Without loss of generality we can assume in the previous proposition that the test functions satisfy additional condition $\int_\Omega g = 0$.*

Let H be a Hilbert space. For a measurable function $f : I \to H$ that satisfies

$$\int_I \|f(x_3)\|_H dx_3 < \infty,$$

we define the integral $\int_I f(x_3) dx_3$ as the unique element of H that satisfies

$$(\int_I f, g)_H = \int_I (f, g)_H dx_3, \quad \forall g \in H.$$

The existence of such integral is easily proved by the Riesz representation theorem. By taking $\int_I f$ as a test function and using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we easily conclude that

$$\| \int_I f \|_H \leq \int_I \|f\|_H.$$

We will usually take $H = L^2(\Omega)$ or $H = L^2(M, d\lambda)$.
By $L^2(\Omega \times I)$ we denote the space of measurable functions $f : \Omega \times I \to \mathbf{R}$ that satisfy $\int_I \|f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dx_3 < \infty$. We can also define the space $W^{1,2}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ in the usual way. By D_{x_3} we denote the derivative in the x_3 direction, looked as the operator that maps $W^{1,2}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ to $L^2(\Omega \times I)$. We define the space $W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ as the space

$$W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I) = W^{1,2}(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(I, W^{1,2}(\Omega)).$$

On the space $W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ we again define the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\#,2}$ in the following way

$$\|u\|^2_{\#,2} = \|D_1 u\|^2 + \|D_2 u\|^2 + \|D_{x_3} u\|^2.$$

By $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ we denote the completition of the space $W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ with respect to the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\#,2}$. By the density argument it can also be seen as the completition of the space $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C^\infty(I)$ with the same norm. The following proposition is useful for proving Proposition 2.19.

Proposition 2.18. *Let $\gamma > 0$ and $f \in (L^2(\Omega \times I))^3$ be such that*

$$\int_{\Omega \times I} f \cdot g = 0, \quad \forall g \in (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(I))^3 \text{ that satisfies}$$
$$D_1 g_1 + D_2 g_2 + \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} g_3 = 0.$$

Then there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ such that

$$f = (D_1\psi, D_2\psi, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3}\psi).$$

Proof. We will take $\gamma = 1$. As in the proof of Proposition 2.14 we conclude that $\int_{\Omega \times I} f(\cdot, \cdot) = 0$. We also transform f to $Vf(\cdot, x_3)$. Again, by using firstly the test functions of the form

$$Vg(m, x_3) = \begin{pmatrix} -a_2(m) k(a_1(m), a_2(m)) V g_1(m) g_2(x_3) \\ a_1(m) k(a_1(m), a_2(m)) V g_1(m) g_2(x_3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

for some $g_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$, $g_2 \in C_0^\infty(I)$, $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$ we conclude that for a.e $(m, x_3) \in M \times I$ and for every $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$ we have

$$a_2(\cdot)k(a_1(\cdot), a_2(\cdot))Vf_1(m, x_3) = a_1(\cdot)k(a_1(m), a_2(m))Vf_2(m, , x_3). \qquad (4)$$

By using the density argument and the test functions of the form

$$Vg(m, x_3) = \begin{pmatrix} -k(a_1(m), a_2(m))Vg_1(m)g_2'(x_3) \\ 0 \\ ia_1(m)k(a_1(m), a_2(m))Vg_1(m)g_2(x_3) \end{pmatrix} \qquad (5)$$

we conclude that for a.e. $(m, x_3) \in M \times I$ and every $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} k(a_1(m), a_2(m))Vf_1(m, x_3) &= ia_1(m)k(a_1(m), a_2(m)) \int_{-1/2}^{x_3} Vf_3(m, t)dt \\ &\quad + s_1^k(m, -1/2), \qquad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where $s_1^k(\cdot, -1/2)$ is defined in the sense of (weak) traces. In the same way we conclude for a.e. $(m, x_3) \in M \times I$ and every $k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} k(a_1(m), a_2(m))Vf_2(m, x_3) &= ia_2(m)k(a_1(m), a_2(m)) \int_{-1/2}^{x_3} Vf_3(m, t)dt \\ &\quad + s_2^k(m, -1/2). \qquad (7) \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $\int_{\Omega \times I} f \cdot g = 0$ we can again conclude that $\int_I Vf(m_0, \omega_2, x, x_3)dx_3 = 0$, for $m_0 \in \{a_1 = 0, a_2 = 0\}$. From the equations (6), (7) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} Vf_1(m_0, x_3) &= s_1^k(m_0, -1/2), \\ Vf_2(m_0, x_3) &= s_2^k(m_0, -1/2), \end{aligned}$$

where k is taken such that it is equal to 1 in the neighbourhood of the origin. Thus we conclude that $Vf_1(m_0, x_3) = Vf_2(m_0, x_3) = 0$.
From this we obtain that $s_1^k(m_0, -1/2) = s_2^k(m_0, -1/2) = 0$. From (4) we derive that for a.e. $m \in M$ we have

$$a_2(m)s_1^k(m, -1/2) = a_1(m)s_2^k(m, -1/2).$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} V\psi^{k,n}(m, x_3) &= k(a_1(\cdot), a_2(\cdot)) \int_{-1/2}^{x_3} Vf_3(m, t)dt - i\frac{s_1^k(m, -1/2)}{a_1(m)} 1_{\{a_1 \geq \frac{1}{n}\}} \\ &\quad - i\frac{s_2^k(m, -1/2)}{a_2(m)} 1_{\{a_1 < \frac{1}{n}, a_2 \geq \frac{1}{n}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we take an increasing sequence $(k_n) \subset C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that $0 \leq k_n \leq 1$ and $k_n \to 1$. It is easily seen that $\psi^{k_n,n} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ and that we have

$$(D_1\psi^{k_n,n}, D_2\psi^{k_n,n}, D_{x_3}\psi^{k_n,n}) \to f \text{ in } (L^2(\Omega \times I))^3.$$

From this we have the claim. □

In the same way as we proved Proposition 2.15, using Proposition 2.14 we can prove the following proposition, using Proposition 2.18. By γ we denote $\gamma = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{h}{\varepsilon(h)}$. h will denote the thickness of the domain while $\varepsilon(h)$ the speed of the oscillations of the material (see the next chapter).

Proposition 2.19. *Let (h_k) be a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero and let (N_k) be a monotonically increasing sequence of integer valued random variables and (u^k) be a bounded sequence in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S \times I))$, such that the sequence of scaled gradients $(\nabla_{h_{N_k}} u^k)$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))$ and for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $u^k(\omega, \cdot)$ converges strongly in L^2 to $u_0(\omega, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S))$. Then there exists a subsequence, still indexed by k, and $u_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)))$ such that*

$$\nabla_{h_{N_k(\omega)}} u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\underset{r}{\rightharpoonup}} \nabla' u_0(\omega_1, x) + (D_1 u_1, D_2 u_1, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u_1)(\omega_1, \omega_2, x).$$

Proof. Notice that indepence of u_0 of the variable x_3 is an immediate consequence of the fact that the scaled gradients are bounded and thus can be concluded, even if not assumed. As in the proof of Proposition 2.15 we take a subsequence such that

$$\nabla u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\underset{r}{\rightharpoonup}} \nabla' u_0 + f,$$

for some $f \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S \times I))$. We take $g^1 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $g^2 \in (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(I))^3$, $g^3 \in C_0^\infty(S)$ such that $D_1 g_1^2 + D_2 g_2^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} g_3^2 = 0$. We define $g = g^1 g^2 g^3$ (the multiplication on both sides is taken as multiplication of a vector with a scalar). Next we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S\times I} f \cdot g \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\Omega\times S\times I} (\nabla_{h_{N_k(\omega)}} u^k(\omega, x, x_3) - \nabla' u_0(\omega, x)) \cdot g^1(\omega) g^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)} x}\omega, x_3) g^3(x) dx dx_3 dP \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \int_{S\times I} (u^k(\omega, x) - u_0(\omega, x)) \Big(g^1(\omega) g_1^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)} x}\omega, x_3) \partial_1 g^3(x) + \\
&\quad + g^1(\omega) g_2^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)} x}\omega, x_3) \partial_2 g^3(x) \Big) dx dP = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude that for a.e. $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S$ we have that

$$\int_{\Omega \times I} f(\omega_1, \cdot, \cdot, x) \cdot g^2 = 0.$$

Using Proposition 2.18 we conclude the claim. □

In the end we will prove the lower semicontinuity with respect to convex functionals.

Proposition 2.20. *Let (ε_k) is a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero and let (N_k) be a monotonically increasing sequence of integer valued random variables and let (u^k) be a bounded sequence in $(L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S)))^n$ such that $u^k \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} u_0 \in (L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S)))^n$. Let $Q : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \to [0, +\infty)$ be a measurable map such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $Q(\omega, \cdot)$ is a positive semidefinite quadratic form, uniformly bounded from above, i.e., there exists a number $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$|Q(\omega, v)| \leq \alpha |v|^2, \forall v \in \mathbf{R}^n, \quad \text{for a.e. } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Let's also assume that (N_k) satisfies the following condition: for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ there exists

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_S Q\left(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x} \omega, u^k(\omega, x)\right) dx. \tag{8}$$

Then we have that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ it is satisfied

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_S Q\left(T_{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}^{-1} x} \omega, u^k(x, \omega)\right) dx \geq \int_S \int_\Omega Q\left(\omega_2, u_0(\omega, \omega_2, x)\right) dP dx.$$

Proof. We take the measurable mapping $L : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $L(\omega)$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite linear operator that satisfies

$$Q(\omega, v) = L(\omega) v \cdot v, \text{ for a.e. } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Take an arbitrary $A \subset \Omega$, $g \in (L^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \otimes C_0^\infty(S))^n$ and calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_A \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q\left(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, u^k(x,\omega)\right) dx = \\
&\qquad \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_A \int_S Q\left(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, u^k(\omega,x)\right) dxdP \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \int_S 1_A(\omega) Q\Big(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, u^k(\omega,x) - g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x) \\
&\qquad\qquad +g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x)\Big) dxdP \\
&\geq \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \int_S 1_A(\omega) L(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega)(u^k(\omega,x) \\
&\qquad\qquad -g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x)) \cdot g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x) dxdP \\
&\quad + \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \int_S 1_A(\omega) L(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega) g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x) \cdot g(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, x) dxdP \\
&= \int_A \int_\Omega \int_S L(\omega_2)(u_0(\omega,\omega_2,x) - g(\omega,\omega_2,x)) \cdot g(\omega,\omega_2,x) dxdPdP \\
&\quad + \int_A \int_\Omega \int_S L(\omega_2) g(\omega,\omega_2,x) \cdot g(\omega,\omega_2,x) dxdPdP.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the density argument we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_A \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q\left(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, u^k(x,\omega)\right) dxdP \geq \\
&\qquad \int_A \int_\Omega \int_S L(\omega_2) u_0(\omega,\omega_2,x) \cdot u_0(\omega,\omega_2,x) dxdPdP.
\end{aligned}$$

From this we have the claim. □

Remark 2.21. *The claims in Proposition 2.12, Proposition 2.13, Proposition 2.15, Proposition 2.20 are still valid under stochastic two-scale convergence in mean defined in Remark 2.7.*

2.3 Application to quadratic functionals

In this section we want to show how we can with the new notion do the stochastic homogenization of the functionals with quadratic energies. We assume that $Q : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \to [0,\infty)$ is a positive definite quadratic form and that there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\alpha|v|^2 \leq Q(\omega, v) \leq \beta|v|^2. \tag{9}$$

For $S \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary and $\omega \in \Omega$ we are looking the following functional

$$\int_S Q(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega, \nabla y)dx - \int_S f \cdot y dx, \tag{10}$$

which we want to minimize among $y \in W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S)$, where $\Gamma \subset \partial S$ a set of positive measure and

$$W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S) = \{y \in W^{1,2}(S) \mid y|_\Gamma = 0\}.$$

We assume Neumann boundary condition at the rest of the boundary and $f \in L^2(S)$ deterministic. It can easily be seen that the minimizers of (10) are measurable (e.g., by pointwise approximation of the quadratic form Q with a sequence of quadratic forms that satisfy (9) and that are simple functions) The following measurability lemma will be useful in the proof of next proposition.

Lemma 2.22. *Let $u^k : \Omega \to X$ be a sequence of measurable functions with values in the complete metric space X such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ the sequence $(u^k(\omega))$ is relatively compact in X. Then there exists a sequence of monotonically increasing integer valued random variables (N_k) such that the sequence (u^{N_k}) is convergent for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Proof. For a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ the set $\{u^k(\omega) \mid k \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is totally bounded. We take the ball $B^k(u^k(\omega), 1)$ of radius 1 around every $u^k(\omega)$. Because of total boundedness there exists a ball that contains infinitely many points of the sequence. Next we take a subsequence that is in this ball and define $N_1(\omega)$ as the index of the first member of the sequence that is contained in this ball. We continue the procedure on this sequence by taking now the balls of radius $\frac{1}{2}$ etc. It is easily seen that this defines an increasing sequence of measurable integer valued functions and that the sequence (u^{N_k}) is a Cauchy sequence and thus convergent. □

Proposition 2.23. *Let (ε_k) be an arbitrary sequence converging to zero and $(y^{\varepsilon_k}_{\min}) \subset L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S))$ be a sequence of minimizers of the functionals given in (10). Then for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $y^{\varepsilon_k}_{\min} \to y^0_{\min}$ in $L^2(S)$, where $y^0_{\min}$ is the minimizer of the functional*

$$\int_S Q_{hom}(\nabla y)dx - \int_S f \cdot y,$$

in the space $W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S)$ and Q_{hom} is the quadratic form given by

$$Q_{hom}(g) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega Q(g + \nabla_\omega u)dP, \tag{11}$$

which satisfies also the relation (9). *Moreover, the minimizer in* (11) *is unique.*

Proof. We will use the arguments of Γ-convergence. We divide the proof into several steps.
Properties of Q_{hom}. It is easily seen that the minimization task in (11) can be interpreted as projection of the constant field $g \in (L^2(\Omega))^n$ on the space of gradients of $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ in the norm given by

$$\|v\|_Q = \int_\Omega Q(\omega, v)dP, \quad \forall v \in (L^2(\Omega))^n,$$

which is equivalent to L^2 norm. From this we conclude the uniqueness of the minimizer and that the mapping

$$g \to \underset{u\in\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \int_\Omega Q(\omega, g + \nabla_\omega u)dP,$$

is linear. The right hand side in (9) is easily proved by taking $u = 0$, while the left hand side easily follows from the fact that $\nabla_\omega u$ is perpendicular to constant functions for any $u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}$.
Compactness. It is obvious, by coercivity and Poincare inequality that the sequence of minimizers is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S))$.
Lower bound. For an arbitrary sequence (ε_k) we take the sequence (y^{ε_k}) that is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S))$ and by using Lemma 2.22 we take an increasing sequence (N_k) of integer valued random variables such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $y^{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}}(\omega)$ converges in L^2 to $y^0(\omega)$. This implies that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, $y^{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}}(\omega)$ converges weakly in $W^{1,2}$ to $y^0(\omega) \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S))$. We take additional sequence of increasing integer valued random variables (L_k) such that for $S_k = N_{L_k}$ we have

a. for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, \nabla y^{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}}(\omega, x))dx = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{S_k(\omega)}x}\omega, \nabla y^{\varepsilon_{S_k(\omega)}}(\omega, x))dx.$$

b. $\nabla y^{\varepsilon_{S_k}} \overset{(S_k)}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla y_0(\omega_1, x) + \nabla_{\omega_2} u(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)$.

By using Proposition 2.19 we conclude that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{N_k(\omega)}x}\omega, \nabla y^{\varepsilon_{N_k(\omega)}}(\omega, x))dx \geq \int_S Q_{\text{hom}}(\nabla y^0(\omega, x))dx. \quad (12)$$

Upper bound. For $y^0 \in W^{1,2}_{0,\Gamma}(S)$ we take $u^0 \in L^2(S, \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega))$ such that

$$u^0(\omega, x) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)} \int_\Omega Q(\omega, \nabla y^0(x) + \nabla_\omega u) dP.$$

We take a sequence $(f^n) \subset C_0^\infty(S) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $f^n \to u^0$ in $L^2(S, \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Next we define the sequence

$$y^{\varepsilon_k, n} = y^0 + \varepsilon_k f^n(T_{\varepsilon_k^{-1} x}\omega, x).$$

It can be easily observed that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that

1. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \|y^{\varepsilon_k, n} - y^0\|_{L^2} = 0.$

2. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_S Q(T_{\varepsilon_k^{-1}} x, \nabla y^{\varepsilon_k, n}) dx = \int_S Q_{\hom}(\nabla y^0) dx.$

The construction of recovery sequence follows by usin Attouch diagonalization lemma.

Conclusion. By using standard Γ-convergence argument we conclude that for an arbitrary sequence (ε_k) and an increasing sequence of integer valued random variables such that the sequence of minimizers $(y_{\min}^{\varepsilon_{N_k}})$ of functional (10) converges in L^2 for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ to the unique minimizer $y^0_{\min}$ of the functional given by (11).

Let's take (ε_k) arbitrary. If it would not be satisfied that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $\|y^{\varepsilon_k}_{\min} - y^0_{\min}\|_{L^2}$ converges to zero, the random variable $d = \limsup_{k\to\infty} \|y^{\varepsilon_k}_{\min} - y^0_{\min}\|_{L^2}$ would be positive on some set of positive measure. We take a sequence (M_k) of integer valued random variables such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|y^{\varepsilon_{M_k}}_{\min} - y^0_{\min}\|_{L^2} = d.$$

Next we continue the procedure on this subsequence and we come to contradiction. □

Remark 2.24. *From the proof of lower bound and of Proposition 2.20 we can see why it is useful to introduce the notion of stochastic two-scale convergence in mean with respect to some sequence of increasing integer valued random variables. Namely, without the assumption* (8) *the proof of Proposition 2.20 would not be possible. However, this assumption can only be satisfied if we choose as indices the sequence of integer valued random variables. Although, apriori the two-scale limit depends on this sequence, in some cases the form of it stays the same (e.g., it has the form of the gradient). This enables us to make the lower bound which does not depend on this sequence.*

Remark 2.25. *In [BMW94] it is only shown that the sequence of minimizers converge stochastically two-scale to the minimizer of the limit. Thus we see that this new notion enables us to conclude the convergence for a.e.* $\omega \in \Omega$.

3 Stochastic homogenization of bending plate model

3.1 General framework and main result

In this chapter $S \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ is a bounded domain and the interval $I = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. By γ we will denote $\gamma = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{h}{\varepsilon(h)}$. We will often skip writing of dependence of $\varepsilon(h)$ on h. The main results are Theorem 3.4 (lower bound) and Theorem 3.5 (upper bound). To prove the Γ-limit result we will need some additional assumption on the domain S. We will assume that the domain S is piecewise C^1. This assumption is necessary only for the proof of upper bound. The lower bound only requires S to be Lipschitz.
Consider a measurable map $W : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^3 \times \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \to [0, +\infty]$, representing the stored energy density function. We will assume the following.

Assumption 3.1. *We assume that W is T-stationary in the sense that, for a.e. $(\omega, x, y, F) \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ we have that*

$$W(T_y\omega, x, F) = W(\omega, x + y, F). \tag{13}$$

We also assume that $W(\omega, x, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ for a.e. $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S$. This will ensure the measurability of all composition mappings that appear (see, e.g., the expression 19) We also assume that the following properties are satisfied

a. *objectivity property*

$$W(\omega, x, RF) = W(\omega, x, F) \quad \text{for a.e. } (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^2, \text{ for all } F \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3},\ R \in \mathrm{SO}(3), \tag{14}$$

b. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &W(\omega, x, F) \geq c_1 \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)), \text{ for a.e. } (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S \text{ and all } F \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \\ &W(\omega, x, F) \leq c_2 \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)), \text{ for a.e. } (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S \text{ and all } F \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{with } \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)) \leq \rho. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

c. *There exist a monotone function $r : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ with $r(t) \downarrow 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$ such that, for a.e. $y \in \mathbf{R}^2$, there exists a quadratic form $Q(\omega, x, \cdot)$ on $\mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ with*

$$|W(\omega, x, I + G) - Q(\omega, x, G)| \leq r(|G|)|G|^2 \text{for all } G \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}. \tag{16}$$

As a consequence of relations (15)-(16) we have the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Let W be as in Assumption 3.1 and let Q be the quadratic form associated with W via* (16)*. Then*

(Q1) Q is ergodic, i.e., for a.e. $(\omega, x, y) \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^2$, for all $G \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$, we have that

$$Q(T_y\omega, x, G) = Q(\omega, x + y, G). \tag{17}$$

(Q2) for a.e. $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^2$ we have that

$$c_1|\operatorname{sym} G|^2 \leq Q(\omega, x, G) = Q(\omega, x, \operatorname{sym} G) \leq c_2|\operatorname{sym} G|^2, \ \forall G \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}. \tag{18}$$

By $Q^0 : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \to [0, \infty)$ we denote the mapping $Q^0(\omega, G) = Q(\omega, 0, G)$. Without the loss of generality we can assume that for a.e. $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$, for all $G \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}$ we have $Q(\omega, x, G) = Q^0(T_x\omega, G)$. We define the set $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \mathrm{SO}(3)))$ in the following way

$$L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \mathrm{SO}(3))) = \{R : \Omega \times S \to \mathrm{SO}(3) : R \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))\}.$$

We define the random functionals $I^h : \Omega \times W^{1,2}(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^3) \to [0, \infty]$

$$I^h(\omega, y) = \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{S\times I} W(\omega, x/\varepsilon, \nabla_h y). \tag{19}$$

When dealing with the bending regime we assume that the above functionals stay bounded as h goes to zero. Here we will assume a bit more, that it is bounded by a constant that depends on the constant that appears in the theorem on geometric rigidity (see [FJM02, FJM06]).
To be more precise we take a sequence (y^h), $y^h : \Omega \to W^{1,2}(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^3)$ measurable, such that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} \limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{S\times I} \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla_h y^h, \mathrm{SO}(3)) < \varepsilon_0, \tag{20}$$

where the constant ε_0 will be chosen in a way to guarantee the compactness result given by Theorem 3.3. One can assure the assumption (20) by assuming the smallnes of the applied forces. We will not go into the details and for more details we refer the reader to the reference [FJM06].
We define $\mathcal{Q}^\gamma : \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2} \to [0, \infty)$ in the following way

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G) = \inf_{u,B} \int_{\Omega\times I} Q^0(\omega, \iota(B + x_3 G) + \operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)) dP dx_3, \tag{21}$$

where the infimum is taken over $u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3$, $B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$. It can be shown that $\mathcal{Q}^\gamma$ is the quadratic form which is coercive on symmetric matrices (see Lemma 3.8).
In the bending regime, by the compactness result (see Theorem 3.3), it can be concluded that the limit deformations are Sobolev isometries. By $W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S)$ and $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S))$ we denote the sets

$$\begin{aligned} W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S) &= \{y \in W^{2,2}(S, \mathbf{R}^3) : \partial_\alpha y \cdot \partial_\beta y = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\}, \\ L^\infty(\Omega, W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S)) &= \{y \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{2,2}(S, \mathbf{R}^3)) : y(\omega) \in W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S) \text{ for a.e. } \omega \in \Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

where we have by δ denoted the Kronecker delta symbol. For $y \in W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S)$ we define its normal $n^y \in W^{1,2}(S, \mathbf{R}^3)$ as $n^y = \partial_1 y \wedge \partial_2 y$ and the second fundamental form II^y as

$$\text{II}^y_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha y \cdot \partial_\beta n^y = -\partial_{\alpha\beta} y \cdot n^y, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2.$$

We define the limit functional $I^0 : W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S) \to [0, \infty)$ in the following way

$$I^0(y) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(\text{II}^y(x))dx.$$

The following compactness result is the direct consequence of [FJM06, Theorem 6 and Remark 5].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(y^h) \subset L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S\times I, \mathbf{R}^3))$ be a sequence that satisfies (20). For ε_0 sufficiently small there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of measurable mappings (R^h), $R^h \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \text{SO}(3)))$ such that*

$$\left\| \frac{\nabla_h y^h - R^h}{h} \right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S\times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))} + \|\nabla' R^h\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))} \leq C\delta_0. \tag{22}$$

The following two theorems are the main result of this section. They correspond to the statement of lower and upper bound for the Γ-limit.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $S \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. Let (y^{h_n}), $y^{h_n} : \Omega \to W^{1,2}(S\times I, \mathbf{R}^3))$, be a sequence that satisfies the assumption (20). Let $(R^{h_n}) \subset L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \text{SO}(3)))$ be a sequence whose existence is guaranteeded by Theorem 3.3.*

a. There exists an increasing sequence of integer valued random variables $(N_k)_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ and $R \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \text{SO}(3)))$, $y \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{2,2}_{iso}(S))$ such that $\partial_\alpha y = R_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1, 2$, and for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$y^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) - \int_\Omega y^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) \to y(\omega), \text{ strongly in } W^{1,2}, \tag{23}$$

$$R^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) \rightharpoonup R(\omega), \text{ weakly in } W^{1,2}, \tag{24}$$

$$\nabla_{h_{N_k}} y^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) \to R(\omega) \text{ strongly in } L^2. \tag{25}$$

b. If (N_k) is an increasing sequence of integer valued random variables that satisfies the claims (23)-(25), then we have for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} I^{h_{N_k}}(\omega, y^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)) \geq I^0(y(\omega)).$$

Theorem 3.5. *For $S \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ with Lipschitz boundary we additionally assume that its normal is continuous away from a subset of ∂S with length zero (e.g., the boundary is piecewise C^1). Let $y : \Omega \to W^{2,2}_{iso}$ be a measurable map. Then there exists a sequence $y^h : \Omega \to W^{1,2}(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^3)$ of measurable maps such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that*

a. $\|y^h(\omega) - y(\omega)\| \to 0$ in $W^{1,2}$;

b. $I^h(\omega, y^h(\omega)) \to I^0(y(\omega))$.

Remark 3.6. *Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.5 imply standard convergence of minimizers for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. However, due to the compactness result, this convergence is valid only on the subsequence, whose indices depend again on $\omega \in \Omega$.*

3.2 Properties of $\mathcal{Q}^\gamma$

The following Korn's inequality can be proved. This is the stochastic variant of Korn's inequality with periodic boundary condition, given in [Neu10].

Proposition 3.7. *There exists $C(\gamma) > 0$ such that for $u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3$ we have*

$$\|D_1 u\|^2_{L^2} + \|D_2 u\|^2_{L^2} + \|D_{x_3} u\|^2_{L^2} \leq C(\gamma) \|\operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)\|^2_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Take $R = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^3$. We will assume $\gamma = 1$, otherwise we rescale the domain. Take $g \in (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega) \times C^\infty(I))^3$ and denote by $M := \|g\|_{L^\infty}$. For every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we define $g^n_\omega : R \to \mathbf{R}^3$ in the following way: For $x_3 \in [-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}]$ we define $g^n_\omega(x, x_3) = \frac{1}{n} g(T_{nx}\omega, n(x_3 + \frac{1}{2}) - \frac{1}{2})$. For $x_3 \in [-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}, -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{n}]$ we define g^n_ω by reflecting the lower part, i.e., $g^n_\omega(x, x_3) = \frac{1}{n} g(T_{nx}\omega, n(-\frac{1}{2} - x_3) + \frac{3}{2}))$. We extend g^n_ω to whole domain by periodicity in x_3. By using Korn's inequality there exist a universal constant $C > 0$ and $A^n_\omega \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}_{skw}$, $b^n_\omega \in \mathbf{R}^3$ such that

$$\|g^n_\omega - A^n_\omega x - b^n_\omega\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq C \|\operatorname{sym} \nabla g^n_\omega\|_{L^2}. \tag{26}$$

Notice that we can conclude, by using trace inequality, that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |A^n_\omega| + |b^n_\omega| &\leq C\left(\|g^n_\omega - A^n_\omega x - b^n_\omega\|_{L^2(\partial R)} + \frac{M}{n}\right) \\ &\leq C\left(\|g^n_\omega - A^n_\omega x - b^n_\omega\|_{W^{1,2}} + \frac{M}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By using triangular inequality we conclude from (26)

$$\|g^n_\omega\|^2_{W^{1,2}} \leq C\left(\|\operatorname{sym}\nabla g^n_\omega\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{M^2}{n^2}\right),$$

for some $C > 0$. From this we conclude that there exists a strip R_k of the form $R_k = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2 \times [-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{k}{n}, -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{k+1}{n}]$, for some $k \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, such that

$$\|\nabla g^n_\omega\|^2_{L^2(R_k)} \leq C\left(\|\operatorname{sym}\nabla g^n_\omega\|^2_{L^2(R_k)} + \frac{M^2}{n^3}\right).$$

After rescaling (and possibly reflecting) the domain and multiplying this inequality with n we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_1 g(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} + \|D_2 g(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} + \|D_{x_3} g(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} \leq \\ &\quad C\Big(\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1,2} \|D_\alpha g_\beta(T_{nx}\omega, x_3) + D_\beta g_\alpha(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} + \\ &\quad \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \|D_\alpha g_3(T_{nx}\omega, x_3) + D_{x_3} g_\alpha(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} + \|D_{x_3} g_3(T_{nx}\omega, x_3)\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{M^2}{n^2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

After integrating this inequality over Ω and letting $n \to \infty$ we obtain the claim. By the density argument the claim follows for every $u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3$. □

The following lemma gives us the properties of $\mathcal{Q}^\gamma$.

Lemma 3.8. *$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma : \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2} \to [0, \infty)$ is a quadratic form and the infimum in the formula (21) is attained. We have the following*

$$\tfrac{c_1}{12}|\operatorname{sym} G|^2 \leq \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G) = \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(\operatorname{sym} G) \leq c_2|G|^2, \quad \forall G \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}. \tag{27}$$

Moreover, for given G, the minimizer $B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\operatorname{sym}}$, $u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3$ are unique and the mapping $G \to (B, u)$ is linear.

Proof. The right inequality in (27) follows by taking $u = 0$, the left inequality follows from the fact that for an arbitrary $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \times I)$ and $B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega\times I} & Q^0(\omega, \iota(B + x_3 G) + \operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u))dP dx_3 \\ &\geq c_1 \|\iota(\operatorname{sym} B + x_3 \operatorname{sym} G) + \operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= c_1 \left(|\operatorname{sym} B|^2 + \tfrac{1}{12} |\operatorname{sym} G|^2 + \|\operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)\|_{L^2}^2 \right).\end{aligned}$$

The attainability of the infimum can be easily argumented by the direct methods of the calculus of variation, Proposition 3.7 and by noticing that the space

$$\mathcal{V}_\gamma = \{\iota(\operatorname{sym} B) + \operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u) : B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}, u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3\},$$

is the linear subspace of $L^2(\Omega \times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3})$, strongly and thus also weakly closed. Moreover, the sum is direct. The quadraticity follows from the fact that we can the minimum problem interpret as the projection on $\mathcal{V}_\gamma$ in the norm defined by the quadratic form Q, which is equivalent on the space $L^2(\Omega\times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}_{\operatorname{sym}})$ to the L^2 norm. The uniqueness of u follows from Proposition 3.7. □

Remark 3.9. *In the same way as the proof of Lemma 3.8 we can prove that the function* $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\gamma : \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2} \times \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2} \to [0, \infty)$ *defined by*

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G, B) = \min_{u\in(\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega\times I))^3} \int_{\Omega\times I} Q^0(\omega, \iota(B+x_3 G)+\operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u))dx_3 dP,$$

is the quadratic form that satisfies

$$\tfrac{c_1}{12}(|\operatorname{sym} G|^2 + |\operatorname{sym} B|^2) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\gamma(G, B) = \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\gamma(\operatorname{sym} G, \operatorname{sym} B) \leq c_2(|G|^2 + |B|^2), \quad \forall G, B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}.$$

For given (G, B) *the minimizer* $u \in (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega\times I))^3$ *is unique and the mapping* $(G, B) \to u$ *is linear. Moreover we have that*

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G) = \min_{B\in\mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\operatorname{sym}}} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\gamma(G, B).$$

The unique minimizer in the above expression is the linear function of G.

3.3 Proof of lower bound

The following proposition gives us the form of stochastic two-scale limit of sequence of rotations and will be used in the lower bound proof.

Proposition 3.10. *Let (ε_k) be a sequence monotonically decreasing to zero and let (N_k) be a monotonically increasing sequence of integer valued random variables, let $(R^{h_k}) \subset L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S, \mathrm{SO}(3)))$ be such that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $R^{h_k}(\omega, \cdot) \to R(\omega, \cdot) \in W^{1,2}(S, \mathrm{SO}(3))$, strongly in L^2. Then there exists $w \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)))$ such that we have*

$$\partial_\alpha R^{h_k}(\omega, x) \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} \partial_\alpha R(\omega_1, x) + R A_{D_\alpha w(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)}, \text{ for } \alpha = 1, 2.$$

Proof. It is easily seen that for a.e. $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S$ we have that $(R^{h_k})^t \partial_\alpha R^{h_k}$, $R^t \partial_\alpha R$ is an antisymmetric matrix. Thus we have from Proposition 2.13 and Proposition 2.15 that there exists $w \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(\Omega \times S, \mathbf{R}^3))$ such that

$$(R^{h_k})^t \partial_\alpha R^{h_k} \overset{(N_k)}{\rightharpoonup} R^t \partial_\alpha R(\omega_1, x) + A_{D_\alpha w(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)}.$$

Again by using Proposition 2.13 we have the claim. □

3.3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof. The proof of claim a follows directly from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.22. To prove the statement b we follow [FJM02] by introducing the approximate strain $G^{h_k} \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))$

$$G^{h_k} = \frac{(R^{h_k})^t \nabla_{h_k} y^{h_k} - I}{h_k}. \tag{28}$$

We set $\overline{y}^{h_k}(\omega, x) = \int_I y^{h_k}(\omega, x, x_3)\, dx_3$ and define $z^{h_k} \in L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^3)$ via

$$y^{h_k}(\omega, x, x_3) = \overline{y}^{h_k}(\omega, x) + h_k x_3 R^{h_k}(\omega, x) e_3 + h_k z^{h_k}(\omega, x, x_3). \tag{29}$$

Then clearly $\int_I z^{h_k}(\omega, x, x_3) dx_3 = 0$ for a.e. $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S$ and we compute

$$\frac{\nabla_{h_k} y^{h_k} - R^{h_k}}{h_k} = \left(\frac{\nabla' \overline{y}^{h_k} - (R^{h_k})'}{h_k} + x_3 \nabla' R_3^{h_k}, 0 \right) + \nabla_{h_k} z^{h_k}. \tag{30}$$

From this we conclude that $\nabla_{h_k} z^{h_k}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))$. By using Poincare inequality we also conclude that z^{h_k} is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, W^{1,2}(S \times I, \mathbf{R}^3))$. Notice also that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $z^{h_k}(\omega, \cdot, \cdot)$ converges strongly to zero. Let S_k (see Proposition 2.12 and Lemma 2.22) be an increasing sequence of integer valued random variables that satisfies the following conditions

1. $R^{h_{S_k}}(\omega,\cdot)$ converges strongly in $L^2(S)$ to $R\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(S,\mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}))$, for a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$;

2. $\nabla' R^{h_{S_k}}$ converges stochastically two-scale in mean with respect to (S_k);

3. $\frac{\nabla'\overline{y}^{h_{S_k}}-(R^{h_{S_k}})'}{h_{S_k}}$ and $\nabla_{h_{S_k}} z^{h_{S_k}}$ converge stochastically two-scale in mean with respect to (S_k).

By using Proposition 2.19 and Proposition 3.10 we conclude that there exist $z_1\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(S,\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega\times I)))$, $w\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(\Omega\times S,\mathbf{R}^3))$ such that

$$\partial_\alpha R^h(\omega,x) \overset{(S_k)}{\searrow} \partial_\alpha R(\omega_1,x)+RA_{D_\alpha w(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)},\ \text{for } \alpha=1,2; \tag{31}$$

$$\nabla_{h_{S_k(\omega)}} z^{h_{S_k}} \overset{(S_k)}{\underset{r}{\searrow}} (D_1 z, D_2 z, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} z)(\omega_1,\omega_2,x). \tag{32}$$

Let's by $T\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(\Omega\times S,\mathbf{R}^{3\times 2}))$ denote the stochastic two-scale limit of $\frac{\nabla'\overline{y}^{h_{S_k}}-(R^{h_{S_k}})'}{h_{S_k}}$. We claim that there exist $\tilde{B}\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(S,\mathbf{R}^{3\times 2}))$ and $\psi\in L^\infty(\Omega,L^2(S,(\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega))^3))$ such that

$$T(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)=\tilde{B}(\omega_1,x)-(RA_{w(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)})'+(D_1\psi,D_2\psi)(\omega_1,\omega_2,x). \tag{33}$$

To prove this we take $g^1\in(L^\infty(\Omega))^3$, $g^2\in(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega))^3$ such that $\int_\Omega g^2=0$, $g^3\in(C_0^\infty(S))^3$ and calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S} T(\omega_1,\omega_2,x)g^1(\omega_1)(-D_2g^2(\omega_2),D_1g^2(\omega_2))g^3(x)dxdPdP=\\
&\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega\int_S \frac{\nabla'\overline{y}^{h_{S_k}}-(R^{h_{S_k}})'}{h_{S_k}}\cdot g^1(\omega)(-D_2g^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{S_k(\omega)}x}\omega),D_1g^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{S_k(\omega)}x}\omega))g^3(x)dxdP\\
&=\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\int_\Omega \tfrac{\varepsilon_{S_k(\omega)}}{h_{S_k(\omega)}}\int_S(-\partial_2R_1^{h_{S_k}},\partial_1R_2^{h_{S_k}})g^1(\omega)g^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{S_k(\omega)}x}\omega)g^3(x)dxdP\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+\left(\nabla'\overline{y}^{h_{S_k}}-(R^{h_{S_k}})'\right)g^1(\omega)g^2(T_{\varepsilon^{-1}_{S_k(\omega)}x}\omega)(\partial_2g^3(x),-\partial_1g^3(x))\right)\\
&=\tfrac{1}{\gamma}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S}((-\partial_2R_1,\partial_1R_2)+(-(RA_{D_2w})_1,(RA_{D_1w})_2))\,g^1(\omega_1)g^2(\omega_2)g^3(x)dxdPdP\\
&=\tfrac{1}{\gamma}\int_{\Omega\times\Omega\times S}((RA_w)_1,(RA_w)_2)g^1(\omega_1)(D_2g^2(\omega_2),-D_1g^2(\omega_2))g^3(x)dxdPdP.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expressions we multiplay vectors g_1 and g_3 with the matrix $(-D_2g^2,D_1g^2)$in a way that we multiply each row of the matrix with the appropriate component of the vector. Thus we conclude that for a.e. $(\omega_1,x)\in$

$\Omega \times S$, $T(\omega_1, \cdot, x) + (R(\omega_1, x) A_{w(\omega_1, \cdot, x)})'$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 2.16 (see Remark 2.17). After defininining

$$\tilde{B}(\omega_1, x) = \int_\Omega \left(T(\omega_1, \cdot, x) + (R(\omega_1, x) A_{w(\omega_1, \cdot, x)})' \right),$$

we obtain the claim. From (30)-(33), by using Proposition 2.13, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} G^{h_{S_k}} \xrightarrow[r]{(S_k)} \; & x_3 R^t(\omega_1, x) \nabla' R_3(\omega_1, x) + R^t(\omega_1, x) \tilde{B}(\omega_1, x) - A_{w(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)} \\ & + x_3 \left(0, 0, (A_{w(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)})_3\right) + (D_1 \psi, D_2 \psi, 0)(\omega_1, \omega_2, x) \\ & + (D_1 z, D_2 z, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} z)(\omega_1, \omega_2, x). \end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude that there exist $B \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\mathrm{sym}}))$, $u \in L^\infty(\Omega, L^2(S, (\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega \times I))^3))$

$$\operatorname{sym} G^{h_{S_k}} \xrightarrow[r]{(S_k)} x_3 \, \mathrm{II}^y(x) + B(\omega_1, x) + (D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)(\omega_1, \omega_2, x). \tag{34}$$

Here B is obtained by taking the first two rows of the matrix $R^t \tilde{B}$ and

$$u = \psi + z + x_3 (A_{w(\omega_1, \omega_2, x)})_3 - x_3 \left((R^t \tilde{B})_{31}, (R^t \tilde{B})_{32}, 0 \right)^t.$$

To obtain lower semicontinuity we want to use the truncation argument. We take an arbitrary sequence (N_k) that satisfies a. We define the random sets $A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) \subset S \times I$ in the following way

$$A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega) := \{(x, x_3) \in S \times I : G^{h_{N_k}}(\omega, x, x_3) \leq \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{h_{N_k}}}\}.$$

It is easy to see, by Chebyshev inequality, that $1_{A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)} \to 1$ strongly in $L^p(S \times I)$, for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, for any $p < \infty$. By using the objectivity property we have

$$W(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{N_k}, \nabla_{h_{N_k}} y^{h_{N_k}}) = W(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{N_k}, I + h_{N_k} G^{h_{N_k}}). \tag{35}$$

Using (16) we conclude for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{k\to\infty} I^{h_{N_k}}(\omega, y^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)) &\geq \liminf_{k\to\infty} 1_{A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)} \frac{1}{h_{N_k}^2} \int_{S\times I} W(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{N_k}, I + h_{N_k} G^{h_{N_k}}) \\ &= \liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{N_k}, 1_{A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)} G^{h_{N_k}}). \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We take the next sequence (L_k) of integer valued random variables such that for $S_k = N_{L_k}$ we have

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{N_k}, 1_{A^{h_{N_k}}(\omega)} G^{h_{N_k}}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{S_k}, 1_{A^{h_{S_k}}(\omega)} G^{h_{S_k}}), \tag{37}$$

and such that 2 and 3 are satisfied. Using Proposition 2.13 we conclude from (34) that

$$\operatorname{sym} 1_{A^{h_{S_k}}} G^{h_{S_k}} \frac{(S_k)}{r} x_3 \operatorname{II}^y(x) + B(\omega_1, x) + (D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)(\omega_1, \omega_2, x). \tag{38}$$

From this, using Proposition 2.20 (see also Remark 2.21) we conclude that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon_{S_k}, 1_{A^{h_{S_k}}(\omega)} G^{h_{S_k}}) \geq \int_S \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(\operatorname{II}^y(x)) dx. \tag{39}$$

□

3.4 Proof of upper bound

In this section we prove upper bound statement. We recall some issues from the periodic homogenization (see [HNV14]). As in [Sch07] and other related results, the key ingredient here is the density result for $W^{2,2}$ isometric immersions established in [Hor11a, Hor11b] (cf. also [Pak04] for an earlier result in this direction). It is the need for the results in [Hor11a] that forces us to consider domains S which are not only Lipschitz but also piecewise C^1. More precisely, we only need that the outer unit normal be continuous away from a subset of ∂S with length zero.
For a given $y \in W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S)$ and for a displacement $V \in W^{2,2}(S, \mathbb{R}^3)$ we denote by q^y_V the quadratic form

$$q^y_V = \operatorname{sym}\left((\nabla y)^T (\nabla V)\right).$$

We denote by $\mathcal{A}(S)$ the set of all $y \in W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}(S, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^\infty(\overline{S}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ with the property that

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{ B \in C^\infty(\overline{S}, \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\text{sym}}) : B = 0 \text{ in a neighborhood of } \{x' \in S : \operatorname{II}^y(x') = 0\} \right\}$$
$$\subset \{q^y_V : V \in C^\infty(\overline{S}; \mathbf{R}^3)\}.$$

In other words, if $y \in \mathcal{A}(S)$ and $B \in C^\infty(\overline{S}, \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\text{sym}})$ is a matrix field which vanishes in a neighborhood of $\{\operatorname{II}^y = 0\}$, then there exists a displacement $V \in C^\infty(\overline{S}; \mathbf{R}^3)$ such that $q^y_V = B$. The necessary lemma for the proof of upper bound is the following lemma, whose proof is given in [Sch07, HNV14].

Lemma 3.11. *The set $\mathcal{A}(S)$ is dense in $W^{2,2}_{iso}(S)$ with respect to the strong $W^{2,2}$ topology.*

Lemma 3.12. *For every $y : \Omega \to W^{2,2}_{iso}$ measurable there exists a sequence (y^k) of measurable maps, $y^k : \Omega \to \mathcal{A}(S)$ such that we have the following*

a. for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $y^k(\omega)$ converges to $y(\omega)$ strongly in $W^{2,2}$.

b. for every k and every $B : \Omega \to \mathcal{S}$ measurable there exists $V : \Omega \to C^\infty(\overline{S}, \mathbf{R}^3)$ measurable such that $q_V^{y^k} = B$.

Proof. The only problem is the measurability question. However, since $W^{2,2}$ is separable, so is $W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}$ in the relative topology. Moreover, there exists a sequence $(z^n) \subset \mathcal{A}(S)$ that is dense in $W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}$. For $y : \Omega \to W^{2,2}_{\text{iso}}$ measurable we define y^k in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} &y^k = z^n 1_{A_n}(\omega), \text{ where} \\ &A_n = \{\omega \in \Omega : \|z^n - y^k(\omega)\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq \frac{1}{n},\ \|z^{n-1} - y^k(\omega)\|_{W^{2,2}} > \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \\ &\qquad\qquad \|z^1 - y^k(\omega)\|_{W^{2,2}} > \frac{1}{n}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The measurability property for the second claim follows from the construction given in [Sch07]. □

3.4.1 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Proof. Because of Lemma 3.12 it is enough to assume that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have that $y(\omega) \in \mathcal{A}(S)$ and that y satisfies b of Lemma 3.12. We take measurable maps $B : \Omega \to \mathcal{S}$ and $V : \Omega \to C^\infty(\overline{S}, \mathbf{R}^3)$ such that $q_V^y = B$. By using the proof of Lemma 3.12 we can assume that y, B and V takes only countably many values. We define the unit normal $n = \partial_1 y \wedge \partial_2 y$. Next we divide the domain S into the small cubes $(D_i^\eta)_{i=1}^n$, $D_i^\eta \subset S$ of size η such that $|S \setminus \cup_{i=1}^n D_i^\eta| \to 0$ as $\eta \to 0$. On each cube we define $A_i^\eta(\omega), B_i^\eta(\omega) \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}_{\text{sym}}$ with

$$A_i^\eta(\omega) = \frac{1}{|D_i^\eta|} \int_{D_i^\eta} \mathrm{II}^{y(\omega)}(x) dx, \quad B_i^\eta(\omega) = \frac{1}{|D_i^\eta|} \int_{D_i^\eta} B(\omega, x) dx.$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\delta < \frac{\eta}{2}$ we define

$$D_i^{\eta,\delta} = \{x \in D_i^\eta : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial D_i^\eta) > \delta\}.$$

Next we take n sequences $(g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega,\cdot,\cdot)) \subset (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)\otimes C^\infty(I))^3$ such that we have $(D_1 g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega), D_2 g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega), \frac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega)) \to (D_1 g_i^{\eta}(\omega), D_2 g_i^{\eta}(\omega), \frac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega))$ in $(L^2(\Omega\times I))^{3\times 3}$ for a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$, where

$$g_i^\eta(\omega_1,\cdot) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{u\in(\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega\times I))^3} \int_{\Omega\times I} Q(\omega, \iota(B_i^\eta(\omega_1) + x_3 A_i^\eta(\omega_1)) + \operatorname{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma} D_{x_3} u)) dx_3 dP.$$

For this sequence it can be assumed that it takes countable many values (in the dense set $\{s^n\} \subset (\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)\otimes C^\infty(I))^3$ in $W^{1,2}$) and that for each $n\in\mathbf{N}$ we have that

$$\{\omega\in\Omega : s^n = g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega)\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

It is not difficult to see that for such defined $g_i^{\eta,k}$ we have that the mapping $(\omega,x,x_3)\to g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega, T_x\omega, x_3)$ is measurable.
We start with the Kirchhoff-Love ansatz, augmented by its linearization induced by the displacement V:

$$v^h(\omega,x,x_3) \;:=\; y(\omega,x) + hx_3 n(\omega,x) + h\left(V(\omega,x) + hx_3\mu(\omega,x)\right),$$

where μ is given by

$$\mu = (I - n\otimes n)(\partial_1 V \wedge \partial_2 y + \partial_1 y \wedge \partial_2 V).$$

We set $R(\omega,x) = (\nabla' y(\omega,x),\ n(\omega,x))$. A straighforward computation shows that

$$\nabla_h v^h = R + h\Big((\nabla' V, \mu) + x_3(\nabla' n, 0)\Big) + h^2 x_3(\nabla'\mu, 0). \tag{40}$$

The actual recovery sequence y^h is obtained by adding to v^h the oscillating correction:

$$y^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega,x,x_3) := v^h(\omega,x,x_3) + h\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_i^{\eta,\delta}(x) R(\omega,x) g_i^{\eta,k}(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega, x_3). \tag{41}$$

Here $\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}$ are (deterministic) functions that satisfy the following conditions

1. $\chi_i^{\eta,\delta} \in C^1(S)$;
2. $|\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}| \le 1$; $\chi_i^{\eta,\delta} = 0$ on $(D_i^\eta \backslash D_i^{\eta,\delta})^c$;
3. $|\nabla\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}| \le \frac{C}{\delta}$, for some $C>0$.

Equations (40) and (41) imply

$$\begin{aligned} R^t\nabla_h y^{\eta,k,\delta,h} = I &+ h\iota\left((\nabla' y)^t(\nabla' V) + x_3\,\mathrm{II}^y\right) + h\left((\mu\cdot\nabla' y)\otimes e_3 + e_3\otimes(n\cdot\nabla' V)\right) \\ &+ h\sum_{i=1}^n \chi_i^{\eta,\delta}(D_1 g_i^{\eta,k}, D_2 g_i^{\eta,k}, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3} g_i^{\eta,k}) \\ &+ h^2 x_3 R^t(\nabla'\mu, 0) + h\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}(R^t\nabla' R) g_i^{\eta,k}, 0\right) \\ &+ h\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\nabla'\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}(x) R(x) g_i^{\eta,k}, 0\right); \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

the argument of $g_i^{\eta,k}$ and of $(D_1 g_i^{\eta,k}, D_2 g_i^{\eta,k}, \frac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3} g_i^{\eta,k})$ is $(\omega, T_{\varepsilon^{-1}x}\omega, x_3)$. Defining

$$G^{\eta,k,\delta,h} = \frac{1}{h}\Big(R^t\nabla_h y^{\eta,k,\delta,h} - I\Big)$$

and using the fact that $n\cdot\nabla V + \mu\cdot\nabla' y = 0$, we deduce from (42) that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{sym} G^{\eta,k,\delta,h} = &\ \iota\,(q_V^y + x_3\,\mathrm{II}^y) + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_i^{\eta,\delta}\operatorname{sym}(D_1 g_i^{\eta,k}, D_2 g_i^{\eta,k}, D_{x_3} g_i^{\eta,k}) + h^2\operatorname{sym}\left(x_3 R^t(\nabla'\mu, 0)\right) \\ &+ h\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{sym}\left(\chi_i^{\eta,\delta}(R^t\nabla' R) g_i^{\eta,k}, 0\right) \\ &+ h\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{sym}\left(\nabla'\chi_i^{\eta,\delta} R g_i^{\eta,k}, 0\right); \end{aligned}$$

From (41) we conclude that

$$\|y^{\eta,k,\delta,h} - y\|_{W^{1,2}} \to 0.$$

Using the objectivity property we conclude

$$W(\omega, x/\varepsilon, \nabla_h y^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega)) = W(\omega, x/\varepsilon, I + hG^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega)).$$

Also we can conclude for a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$

$$\left|\frac{1}{h^2}W(\omega, x/\varepsilon, \nabla_h y^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega)) - Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon, G^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega))\right| \to 0, \tag{43}$$

uniformly in h. It is not difficult to conclude for a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0}\lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{\delta\to 0}\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^2}\int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon, G^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega)) = \int_S \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^\gamma(B(\omega,x), \mathrm{II}^y(\omega,x))dx.$$

By choosing appropriate B (see Remark 3.9) we conclude that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0}\lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{\delta\to 0}\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^2}\int_{S\times I} Q(\omega, x/\varepsilon, G^{\eta,k,\delta,h}(\omega)) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(\mathrm{II}^y(\omega,x))dx.$$

The claim now follows by a classical diagonal argument and the lemma of Attouch. □

4 Examples for the probability space

The first example is the standard one and is already given in [PV81]. It covers the case of periodic homogenization.

Example 4.1. *We take $W : \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \to [0,\infty]$ that is 1-periodic and that satisfies the property a, b, c from Assumption 3.1. Next we take $\Omega = T^2$ the unit 2-dimensional torus with the σ-algebra of Lebesgue measurable sets and the probability P equals to Lebesgue measure on T^2 which is invariant under translation $T_x\omega = \omega + x$ (mod 1). The infinitesimal generators are the usual partial derivatives, for $i = 1, 2$:*

$$D_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial\omega_i}\ (\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2)).$$

In the end we define $W(\omega, x, F) = W(\omega + x, F)$. In this case we obtain for $\mathcal{Q}^\gamma$ the following formula

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G) = \inf_{u,B}\int_{T^2\times I} Q(x, \iota(B + x_3 G) + \mathrm{sym}(D_1 u, D_2 u, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3}u))dxdx_3, \quad (44)$$

where the infimum is taken over $u \in W^{1,2}(T^2 \times I, \mathbf{R}^3)$, $B \in \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$.

In [PV81] it is also shown how almost periodic case can be covered with the abstract approach of stochastic homogenization. Periodic (or almost periodic) homogenization naturally destroys the isotropic character of the energy density, even if the constituents are isotropic. In the next example we want to show how we can obtain the isotropic energy density out of isotropic constituents by stochastic homogenization.

Example 4.2. *We would like to construct the probability space that consists of some subset of functions on $\mathbf{R}^2$ (taking values in ,e.g., some finite set $S_k = \{1, \ldots, k\}$ representing k different materials) that is invariant under rotations of coordinate system and moreover that the probability measure is invariant under this rotation. One possible construction can be made*

using Poisson process. We construct the probability space that consists of piecewise continuous functions that take values in the set S_k. Namely, the construction of the probability space goes as follows: we take k independent Poisson processes $\mathcal{P}_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ in $\mathbf{R}^2$ and k energy density functions $W^i : \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3} \to [0, \infty]$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ that satisfy the properties a, b, c from the Assumption 3.1 and that are isotropic ,i.e., they satisfy

$$W(\omega, x, FR) = W(\omega, x, F), \text{ for all } F \in \mathbf{R}^{3\times 3}, R \in \mathrm{SO}(3),$$
$$\text{for a.e. } (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times S.$$

This implies that the same property is valid for the appropriate quadratic forms Q^i. Out of each realization of Poisson point process we make the material mixture in the following way: the point $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ is occupied by the material i if the point x is in the Voronoi cell of the point of the process $\mathcal{P}_i$. In that way we obtain the probability space where

$$\Omega = \{\text{piecewise constant functions that take values in the set } S_k \text{ and that are constructed using } k \text{ independent Poisson processes }\};$$

for σ-algebra we take the one generated by the sets

$$\{f \in \Omega \mid f(x_l) = i_l; x_l \in \mathbf{Q}^2, i_l \in S_k, \text{ for } l = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

For the probability measure we take the push forward of the measure given by k independent Poisson processes. The action T_x is simply given by the translation $T_x\omega(y) = \omega(x + y)$. It is easily seen that this action is measure preserving (since the distribution of Poisson process is translation invariant) and ergodic. The ergodicity follows from the fact that the Poisson process is ergodic and from the fact that the probability measure is just push forward. The energy density we define in the following way:

$$W(\omega, x, F) = W^i(\omega, x, F), \quad \text{if } \omega(x) = i.$$

For $R \in \mathrm{SO}(2)$ we define the rotational transformation $R_t : \Omega \to \Omega$ in the following way

$$R_t(\omega)(x) = \omega(Rx), \text{ for all } x \in \mathbf{R}^2.$$

Notice that R_t is measure preserving. By $\tilde{R}$ we denote the matrix in $\mathrm{SO}(3)$, $\tilde{R} = \iota(R) + e_3 \otimes e_3$. From the properties of the infinitesimal generator we easily conclude for $f \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$

$$(D_1(f \circ R_t), D_2(f \circ R_t)) = (D_1 f \circ R_t, D_2 f \circ R_t)R.$$

From cell formula (21) *we conclude*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(GR) &= \inf_{u,B}\int_{\Omega\times I} Q^0(\omega,\iota(B+x_3GR)+(D_1u,D_2u,\tfrac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3}u))dPdx_3\\ &= \inf_{u,B}\int_{\Omega\times I} Q^0(\omega,\iota(BR^t+x_3G)+(D_1u,D_2u,\tfrac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3}u)\tilde{R}^t)dPdx_3\\ &= \inf_{u,B}\int_{\Omega\times I} Q^0(\omega,\iota(B+x_3G)+(D_1u,D_2u,\tfrac{1}{\gamma}D_{x_3}u))dPdx_3\\ &= \mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G).\end{aligned}$$

The infima are taken for $u\in(\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega\times I))^3$, $B\in\mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$. *This proves the isotropy.*

Remark 4.3. *Notice that in the first example we can write the cell formula in the following way*

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G)=\inf_{u,B}\int_{\gamma T^2\times I} Q^0(x,\iota(B+x_3G)+\mathrm{sym}(D_1u,D_2u,D_{x_3}u))dxdx_3,$$

where the infimum is taken over $u\in W^{1,2}(\gamma T^2\times I,\mathbf{R}^3)$, $B\in\mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$. *In the second example we can write the cell formula in the following way*

$$\mathcal{Q}^\gamma(G)=\inf_{u,B}\int_{\Omega^d\times I} Q^0(\omega,\iota(B+x_3G)+(D_1u,D_2u,D_{x_3}u))dPdx_3,$$

where the infimum is taken for $u\in(\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(\Omega^d\times I))^3$, $B\in\mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$. *Here,* Ω^d *is the transformed set of functions, where the transformation is given by*

$$\omega^d(x)=\omega(\gamma x),\ \textit{for every}\ \omega\in\Omega.$$

This transformation changes the intensity of the Poisson in the background. This explains the meaning of the parameter γ. *Namely, although it seems* $\varepsilon(h)$ *has not clear physical meaning, its meaning is incorporated in the probability space in the background, in the first case it is the size of the cell of the periodicity, while in the second it is connected with the inensity of the Poisson process in the background.*

Acknowledgement. This second author has been fully supported by Croatian Science Foundation grant number 9477.

References

[BMW94] Alain Bourgeat, Andro Mikelić, and Steve Wright. Stochastic two-scale convergence in the mean and applications. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 456:19–51, 1994.

[CDG02] Juan Casado-Díaz and Inmaculada Gayte. The two-scale convergence method applied to generalized Besicovitch spaces. *R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 458(2028):2925–2946, 2002.

[DMM86a] Gianni Dal Maso and Luciano Modica. Nonlinear stochastic homogenization. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 144:347–389, 1986.

[DMM86b] Gianni Dal Maso and Luciano Modica. Nonlinear stochastic homogenization and ergodic theory. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 368:28–42, 1986.

[FJM02] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 55(11):1461–1506, 2002.

[FJM06] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. A hierarchy of plate models derived from nonlinear elasticity by gamma-convergence. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 180(2):183–236, 2006.

[GD] Antoine Gloria and Mitia Duerinckx. Stochastic homogenization of nonconvex unbounded integral functionals with convex growth. *Preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05000.*

[HNV14] Peter Hornung, Stefan Neukamm, and Igor Velčić. Derivation of a homogenized nonlinear plate theory from 3d elasticity. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, pages 1–23, 2014.

[Hor11a] Peter Hornung. Approximation of flat $W^{2,2}$ isometric immersions by smooth ones. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 199(3):1015–1067, 2011.

[Hor11b] Peter Hornung. Fine level set structure of flat isometric immersions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 199(3):943–1014, 2011.

[JKO94] V. V. Jikov, S. M. Kozlov, and O. A. Oleĭnik. *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian [G. A. Iosif′yan].

[MV] Marohnić Maroje and Igor Velčić. Non-periodic homogenization of bending-torsion theory for inextensible rods from 3d elasticity. *accepted in Annali di Matematica, Pura ed Applicata, DOI: 10.1007/s10231-015-0504-0*.

[Neu10] Stefan Neukamm. *Homogenization, linearization and dimension reduction in elasticity with variational methods*. Phd thesis, Tecnische Universität München, 2010.

[Pak04] Mohammad Reza Pakzad. On the Sobolev space of isometric immersions. *J. Differential Geom.*, 66(1):47–69, 2004.

[PV81] G. C. Papanicolaou and S. R. S. Varadhan. Boundary value problems with rapidly oscillating random coefficients. In *Random fields, Vol. I, II (Esztergom, 1979)*, volume 27 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 835–873. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1981.

[RS80] Michael Reed and Barry Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I.* Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, second edition, 1980. Functional analysis.

[Sch07] Bernd Schmidt. Plate theory for stressed heterogeneous multilayers of finite bending energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 88(1):107–122, 2007.

[SW11] Mamadou Sango and Jean Louis Woukeng. Stochastic two-scale convergence of an integral functional. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 73(1-2):97–123, 2011.

[Vel] Igor Velčić. On the general homogenization for the equations of von kármán plate. *accepted in Analysis and Applications, DOI:10.1142/S0219530515500244*.

[Vel15] Igor Velčić. On the derivation of homogenized bending plate model. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 53(3-4):561–586, 2015.

[ZP06] V. V. Zhikov and A. L. Pyatnitskiĭ. Homogenization of random singular structures and random measures. *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, 70(1):23–74, 2006.